

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 16 and 20 have been amended and claims 6, 11 and 21 have been canceled. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Office. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0055878), hereafter “Burton,” in view of Klatt (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,277), hereafter “Klatt.” Applicants assert that the references cited by the Office do not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 9 and 16, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest that the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented to the administrator within a single browser window without opening multiple browser windows. In contrast, the figure of Burton cited by the Office in its arguments to the contrary shows two different sets of data that may be displayed. However, the figures and corresponding text in the specification of Burton does not disclose that the display is accomplished in a single browser window without opening multiple browser windows.

In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented to the administrator within a single browser window without opening multiple browser windows." Claim 1. As such, unlike the figures of Burton, the view of the claimed invention is presented within a single browser window without opening multiple browser windows. Thus, the Burton does not teach or suggest the single window view of the claimed invention. Klatt does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claim 9 and dependent claims 5 and 20, Applicants respectfully submits that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest wherein the system-initiated item request is processed differently from user-initiated item requests in batch with other system-initiated item requests. The Office states that batch processing is old and well known in the art. Applicants respectfully object to the Office's use of what amounts to Official Notice and state that such use of batch processing is not obvious to one skilled in the art as asserted by the Office, especially in this type of context. Furthermore, neither of the references cited by the Office discloses processing user initiated item requests differently from system initiated requests, which are processed in batch. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: July 11, 2008

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)